

## MINUTES HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION SEPTEMBER 11, 2019

Minutes of the regular hearing of the Historic Preservation commission, of the City of Tempe, which was held at the Hatton Hall, 34 East Seventh Street, Tempe, Arizona.

### Regular Meeting 6:02 PM

**Present:**

Chuck Buss, Chair	Chad Weaver, Community Development Director
Martin Ball, Vice-Chair	John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer
Matthew Bilsbarrow	Sarah Adame, Executive Assistant
Jim Garrison	Blake Schimke, Planner
Laurene Montero	
Elizabeth Gilbert	
Greg Larson	
Joe Nucci	
Christopher Garraty	

**Staff:**

- 1) **Call to Audience:** Persons wishing to address the Commission on any matter may do so at the discretion of the Chair. However, Arizona Open Meeting Law limits Commission discussion to matters listed on the posted agenda. Other topics may be placed on a future agenda for discussion.

-----

- 2) Voting of the Meeting Minutes

**Motion** by Commissioner Bilsbarrow to approve the Meeting Minutes of July 10, 2019; second by Commissioner Gilbert. Motion passed on 7-0 vote.

**Ayes:** Chuck Buss, Martin Ball, Matthew Bilsbarrow, Jim Garrison, Laurene Montero, Elizabeth Gilbert, Greg Larson

**Nays:** None

**Abstain:** Joe Nucci

**Absent:** Christopher Garraty

-----

- 3) Review and possible action on proposed Urban Core Master Plan/TOD/General Plan Amendment

Presentation by Staff, Chad Weaver

Mr. Chad Weaver presented the possible action on the proposed Urban Core Master Plan/TOD/General Plan Amendment. There are 3 parts to this plan. The first part is the Urban Core Master Plan is a document that describes at a policy level what is going on in the city and where we want to go. The second part is the Transportation Overlay District that has evolved into an overlay that has a opt into an entire zoning district. The third part is a General Plan Amendment which support the first two parts of the plan. A brief description of the Map of UCD Zones shows areas of the variety of high, medium, and low intensity within the boundaries of the UCD Zones which are downtown Tempe through the most eastern area of Tempe along Apache Boulevard. The UCD Zones explain the heights and densities of the area and they are listed: UC-1 – UC-7. The area of focus is the for this Commission is the Downtown Heritage Core Designation. This is the area from 4<sup>th</sup> Street to 6<sup>th</sup> Street, which contains several historic properties, and is recognized as Downtown “Heritage Core” in the UCMP. The proposed “Historic Core” will help facilitate Historic Preservation through several means by creating a public identity for Tempe’s Historic Buildings on Mill Avenue and creating design guidelines to foster historic preservation in the Downtown Heritage Core. The underlying zoning for this area is what anyone can build out there now by right. The Urban Code District can raise that height. This is an opportunity for developers to opt into it. There was a subcommittee formed by a few representatives of this commission and a few representatives from the Historic Preservation Foundation. A recommendation from the subcommittee is to propose 55’ from 45’ in height. The 55’ gives more design options and a height has been established from the past. The step back which is going up from the street face but keeping the street front scale of the is historic buildings was proposed at 30’ however this height could lose the effectiveness and challenges the building in narrow sites. Currently the step back is at 20’ which is a 5’ increase that is an effective distance.

There is another City-wide effort in process called Historic Preservation Plan and Archeology Treatment. This effort could bring more buildings into discussion. This effort is to formally document or officially designate those buildings historically recognized nationally or locally.

The Commission gave feedback on the presentation. It was noted that there is less density on the eastside of the Historic Mill Avenue buildings, lower heights to the east, and to the west it looks the same. Are the buildings on the eastside of the streets more important than the ones on the westside? The plan is all in the same district and stretches out a little farther out to the east side because there are traditional Butte issues and there is city owned land to the eastside. The map is showing the highest heights possible on the back of the historic buildings. Can there be at 100 to 300 feet lower before the “sky is the limit”? The plan is trying to protect and respect by building design guidelines and step backs and set backs by using the bonus process to regulate the heights. The current height that the buildings are built at 50 or 100 feet depending on the approximately of the station. The frontage of Mill Avenue is 90 feet and the option to get to 160 feet will be through the bonus program. The Bonus Program is a system that will create a benefit to the public that will provide an opportunity for the developer to give back to the City in order to achieve higher heights. The Commission would like to add to the documentation if the developer is in with in 100 to 200 feet of the historic building, they are not going to be given the 250 feet in height but may get more depending on how far away they build from the historic building. Staff advised that this suggestion would be considered but advised that there should be some additional offer to the core that could be identified.

The Commission appreciates that there is an attempt to develop an understanding of both potentials of requesting for greater heights for the structure and form of the building to open up view paths. It is something that is different in Tempe. The consideration of the view corridors to the Butte, having a condition for developer who want to build something tall will be giving the option to incorporate some designs for the structure that gives the City a mechanism to sculpt that solution in order to ensure that that monolithic buildings are built. The current zoning asks to maximize the height of a site for the development which then develops long bar type structure without much interest in the sky lines. Having a mechanism supports and additional input from the city is a positive thing in order to ensure what is left of the view corridors to the Mountain Top. Another positive is incorporating a historic bonus credits is a dialogue that might look more closely at a way that a new structure would impact those attributes of the historic structure designation.

A member of the subcommittee gave an update on the work that was done to give input for this process. The subcommittee came together and created the Historic Core. He stated that the only influence the conceptual document, that is the Urban Core Master Plan. He stated that the committee had not seen this progress reflected

across the suited documents specifically it's lacking from footnote of table 5A in the heights specified in the Urban Code District and the Transportation Overlay District and the in the General Plan Amendment. He said that the subcommittee is very close but not there yet to completion and will continue to work with staff. The subcommittee will have something of substance that will preserve, protect, and distinguish the Historic Core. There needs to be something influenced and documented regulatory across the suited documents.

The Commission asked for more information about the Bonus Program. What is the value being placed on upon the historic fabric? For example: if a development is trying to achieve height to get to 50 points, if 30 points of that 50 points is to say that the development is a historic structure and if the development in bit of a limbo then that's a good incentive. The Bonus Program is in comparison with the city of Phoenix whereas preservation was in mind and that preservation is the key for the full value of redevelopment. How much point is available totally and how many do you get for preservation? Clearly in Phoenix, this is preservation strategy and is this true for Tempe?

Staff advised the Commission that this works somewhat for preservation but there are other ways to get points that would not require preservation which is why there is a study where development can get their points without investing a lot. Staff advised the Commission of the timeline in which this process of approval has gone through the Development Review Commission and is moving forward to Council starting with the first hearing on Sept. 26, 2019 and for the second hearing on Oct. 17, 2019. Staff can come back to the Commission at another meeting after the Council's first review, October 9, 2019. The Commission decided to vote in a few motions to advise Council that they are still "pondering".

Mr. Stew Siefer, Historic Preservation Foundation Officer, advised that he was part of the subcommittee that met with staff and assisted with creating the Historic Core. He is very happy with that outcome. The issue of building heights remains. The understanding is that the developer can build up to 90 feet in UC-2. Here the start is at 50 feet, the step back is 20 feet and then its development can go up to 90 feet. The view is that a 90-foot building hovering over a historic building, will completely overwhelm the character and scale of the historic building. Mr. Siefer wishes to continue this review of the UCMP and come up with a good formula. Mr. Siefer would like to see a much greater step back and have a height limit of 50 or 60 feet along UC-2.

Public Comment, Vic Linoff, Property Owner, Historic Preservation Foundation Officer, shared his concerns with how much will this cost him and how much more in property tax. He had questions about the point system. Can those point be sold? Exchanged for money? Has anyone talked about Transportation issues especially traffic of north Tempe and the Streetcar? He spoke about his concerns about the Butte. Mr. Linoff expressed that the Commission should be concerned about the consequences and take more time to make a better decision.

Public Comment, Dawn Hart, Architect, Historic Preservation Foundation Officer, shared that she thinks that the historic character and scale, of Mill Avenue make Tempe a destination place to be. The reason that people want to be here is because of 5<sup>th</sup> Street and the value that it brings. She encourages the Commission that it very much work taking some extra time.

Commissioner Nucci restated his concerns to save the "Golden Goose". People come here for the history. As the City is creating the Historic Core it will be preserving Downtown Tempe. He will continue to fight for 50 feet height.

The Commission agrees to create a signal or motion to notify Council that they think that this is very positive and support for continued conversation on a few points having to do with the Bonus Program, caring for the Downtown Historic Core, and to continue to explore and incorporate into the documents of the whole UCMP.

Comm. Joe Nucci proposed a motion that the Tempe Historic Preservation supports the Urban Core Master Plan policy level document, creation of the Historic Core, with the guidelines and the language to support that in the policy level document that is the UCMP and that the Commission would like to see the regulatory documents that are accompanying the policy level document through the approval process show coordination with respect to the Historic Core and specifically that the Urban Code District and General Plan Amendment reflect the Historic Core and the ..... from the subcommittee as a condition of support for the package of the suited documents that the heights within the area indicated as the Historic Core from 4<sup>th</sup> Street south to 6<sup>th</sup> Street on either side of Mill Avenue are not increased from what they are today which is 50 to 100 feet.

(Motion failed due to lack of second)

**Motion:** Comm. Matthew Bilsbarrow motion that the Commission ask for more information about Bonus Point system and how historic preservation will be incorporated into the development bonus program.

**Amendment to this motion:** Comm. Gregory Larson add an amendment to this motion as stated, to add transferability of the points/bonuses.

Comm. Matthew Bilsbarrow agrees to the amendment.

**Second:** Comm. Charles Ball

**Vote: 9-0**

**Ayes:** Comm. Charles Ball, Comm. Matthew Bilsbarrow, Comm. Christopher Garraty, Comm. James Garrison, Comm. Elizabeth Gilbert, Comm. Gregory Larson, Comm. Laurene Montero, Comm. Chuck Buss, and Comm. Joe Nucci.

**Nays:** None.

**Abstain:** None.

**Absent:** None.

**Motion:** Comm. Joe Nucci motion the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission supports the Urban Core Master Plan policy level document, based on creation of the Historic Core with the condition that height in the Historic Core between 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> streets with the inclusion of the Casa Loma, with the condition that height in the Historic Core does not increase from what it is today which is 50 to 100 feet, based on where property exist in the Core.

**Second:** Gregory Larson seconded the motion

**Vote: 9-0**

**Ayes:** Comm. Charles Ball, Comm. Matthew Bilsbarrow, Comm. Christopher Garraty, Comm. James Garrison, Comm. Elizabeth Gilbert, Comm. Gregory Larson, Comm. Laurene Montero, Comm. Chuck Buss, and Comm. Joe Nucci.

**Nays:** None.

**Abstain:** None.

**Absent:** None.

**Motion:** Comm. Joe Nucci motioned the Tempe Historic Preservation Commission supports the Urban Code District and General Plan Amendment, with the condition that both documents are revised to incorporate the preservation goals and strategies expressed in the UCMP.

**Second:** Comm. Charles Ball seconded the motion.

**Vote: 9-0**

**Ayes:** Comm. Charles Ball, Comm. Matthew Bilsbarrow, Comm. Christopher Garraty, Comm. James Garrison, Comm. Elizabeth Gilbert, Comm. Gregory Larson, Comm. Laurene Montero, Comm. Chuck Buss, and Comm. Joe Nucci.

**Nays:** None.

**Abstain:** None.

**Absent:** None.

- 
- 4) Discuss and consider priorities and direction related to Historic Preservation Plan updates and completion of an historic property survey and inventory of properties built between 1961 and 1975. inclusive

Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Southard informed the commissioners that there is funding provide for the historic properties survey inventory for properties built between 1961 and 1975 inclusive through out Tempe of all property types. He would like some input on what would be helpful.

### **Commission Discussion**

Chair Buss acknowledged Vice Chair Ball

Vice Chair Ball stated that from what he has seen first is prioritizing the areas that are under the most intense development pressure. In terms of identification of the ones that might have a chance to get listed. Giving the fact that there is a lot of pressure from the Gila River South to the US 60 is an area of concern that needs attention. Regarding subcategory that are not given a lot of attention would be retail structures and small commercial. The retail structures and small commercial buildings are great examples of their times. Some of the business owners do not want to have their hands tied regarding what they may or may not be able to do in future projects. Also, they can be a great example of success stories; for example, the work that was done at the Uptown plaza in Phoenix to make the series of the structure shine like it did when it originally opened. An example of one in Tempe would be the Fate Brewery on Southern.

Chair Buss stated that he would like to add that here are a lot of subdivision between Broadway and US 60 going south and he would like to see that they are not just inventoried but also listed as Mid Century modern in that area. There also has not been much attention to apartments. There are a few near Dorsey and Rural North of Apache where a lot of them have been torn down and replaced with the stucco boxes.

Chair Buss acknowledged Commissioner Nucci

Commissioner Nucci stated that regarding property types in regard to look at the periods between 1961 and 1975 it over shoots the market. There is going to be a break in the 1973 energy crisis and the stucco square mile. Right now, this is the period of Industrial revolution and with the Tempe Urban Core Master Plan there is a new land use category proposed called Mixed Use. For the area along the tracks particularly South of Broadway there is room to give the effect of taking something that is outdated and creating something new that will give a good sense of where they fit in the purposed mixed use.

Commissioner Garrison stated that one of the best places to start is with the City owned properties.

-----

#### 5) 2020 Arizona Historic Preservation Conference update

##### Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Southard informed the Commission that this year the Conference will be in Tempe at the Double Tree. Dave who has worked with the Historic Preservation will be helping organize the conference which is his profession. The conference will be held on a Tuesday through Thursday.

-----

#### 6) Charles T. Hayden House Update

##### Presentation by Staff, John Southard, Historic Preservation Officer

Mr. Southard informed the board that Reggie is still working his magic and getting a lot of work done. There has been a completion of the windows and a good deal of the interior work has been done. Reggie hopes to have the Adobe work done by December.

-----

#### 7) Chair / Staff Updates

8) Current Events / Announcements / Future Agenda Items

- Member Announcements
- **Staff Announcements**

Hearing adjourned at 7:56pm

Prepared by: Brittainy Nelson, Administrative Assistant  
Reviewed by:

SA:bn

---